

Appl. No. 09/745,826  
Amdt. dated July 10, 2006  
Amendment

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-98 are pending. Among them, claims 64 and 65 are withdrawn from consideration, so claims 1-63 and 66-98 are subject to examination. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

In the Office Action mailed January 11, 2006, claims 1-24, 26-63, 66-83, and 86-98 were rejected as follows:

- i) Claims 1-3, 9, 12-14, 22, 23, 30-32, 38-40, 43-45, 53, 54, 66-68, 74, 77-79, 87, 88, and 95-98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Balaban et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,783) in view of Lyons (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,232).
- ii) Claims 10, 11, 41, 42, 75, and 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Balaban et al. in view of Lyons and Ghandour et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,276).
- iii) Claims 4-8, 15, 24, 28, 29, 33-37, 46, 55, 56, 69-73, 80, 86, 89, and 90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Balaban et al. in view of Lyons and Keeseey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,598,055).
- iv) Claims 16-21, 47-52, 81-83, and 86 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Balaban et al. in view of Lyons, Keeseey et al. and Ghandour et al.
- v) Claims 26, 27, 57-63, and 91-94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Balaban et al. in view of Lyons, Keeseey et al., and Hacia et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,342,355).

Additionally, claims 84-85 appear to have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Balaban et al. in view of Lyons, Keeseey et al. and Ghandour et al.

Appl. No. 09/745,826  
Amdt. dated July 10, 2006  
Amendment

PATENT

Applicant respectfully traverses all of the Examiner's rejections. Balaban, Lyons, Ghandour, Keeseey, and Hacia, even if combined, fail to disclose or suggest all limitations of claims 1-24, 26-63, and 66-98.

A. Claim 1

More particularly, claim 1 recites "grouping a set of data according to its most common access requirements into a plurality of groups." (emphasis added). Balaban and Lyons, even if combined, fail to disclose or suggest these claim limitations.

In the Office Action mailed January 11, 2006, the Examiner asserted that Balaban teaches grouping a set of data which is a set of records and this set of data (i.e., records) is grouped according to its most common access requirements (i.e., key attributes). Office Action, page 7. Moreover, the Examiner cited col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 6 of Balaban as follows:

FIG. 3 is a key to the ERD that will be used to describe the contents of chip design database 102. A representative table 302 includes one or more key attributes 304 and one or more non-key attributes 306. Representative table 302 includes one or more records where each record includes fields corresponding to the listed attributes. The contents of the key fields taken together identify an individual record. In the ERD, each table is represented by a rectangle divided by a horizontal line. The fields or attributes above the line are key while the fields or attributes below the line are non-key. An identifying relationship 308 signifies that the key attribute of a parent table 310 is also a key attribute of a child table 312. A non-identifying relationship 314 signifies that the key attribute of a parent table 316 is also a non-key attribute of a child table 318. Where (FK) appears in parenthesis, it indicates that an attribute of one table is a key attribute of another table. For both the non-identifying and the identifying relationship, one record in the parent table corresponds to one or more records in the child table. Balaban, col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 6 (emphasis added).

But the above paragraph does not appear to support the Examiner's assertion that Balaban teaches that this set of data (i.e., records) is grouped according to its most common access requirements (i.e., key attributes).

Appl. No. 09/745,826  
Amdt. dated July 10, 2006  
Amendment

PATENT

Specifically, Balaban does not teach or suggest that grouping a set of data according to its key attribute requirements is the same as grouping a set of data according to its most common access requirements. The key attribute requirements taught by Balaban appear to require that "the contents of the key fields taken together identify an individual record." Balaban, col. 5, lines 60-61 (emphasis added). Hence the key attribute requirements are different from the most common access requirements.

The most common access requirements, for example, can be applied so that "in one preferred embodiment, probe array intensities may be grouped into probe sets, because, most likely the intensity values in a probe set are accessed at the same time." Specification, page 20 (emphasis added). Therefore, the most common access requirements are related to most common access. In contrast, the key attribute requirements are related to identifying an individual record. The records corresponding to the same key attributes, if any, may not satisfy the most common access requirements.

Therefore, the most common access requirements as recited in claim 1 are different from the key attribute requirements as recited in Balaban. Hence Claim 1 is allowable for at least the above reasons.

B. Claims 2-24, 26-63, and 66-98

In light of the above, claims 2-24, 26-63, and 66-98 are allowable for substantially the same reason as claim 1, and particularly for the specific features they recite.

Claim 25

In the Office Action mailed January 11, 2006, the Examiner does not appear to have provided any ground of rejection for claim 25. Hence, claim 25 does not appear to have been examined. Applicant believes claim 25 should have been allowed.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/745,826  
Amdt. dated July 10, 2006  
Amendment

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel Mao  
Reg. No. 51,995

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
DM:ejt  
60814090 v1